Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 are pending in the present application. By this

amendment, claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are amended and claims 3, 7, 8, 11 and 22-43 are

canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and

the following remarks is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated in the Remarks set

forth below, the amendments to the claims are made for the purpose of correcting informalities

and/or to more clearly define the claimed invention, and are not made for the purpose of

overcoming the cited art.

The Patent Office objects to the Specification because an internet address on page 67,

line 8 is inappropriately notated. The Specification has been amended to correct this notation,

as well as another internet address notation on page 67, line 20. Accordingly, withdrawal of the

objection is respectfully requested.

The Patent Office rejects claims 1-21, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant

regards as the invention. Claims 3, 7, 8, 11 and 22-43 have been canceled, and thus their

rejection is moot. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Patent Office alleges that the term "substantial change" in claim 1 is a

relative term which renders the claim indefinite, and that it is not clear if the term "means the

same kind of change (such as color change vs. electron change etc.) and what level qualifies for

8

Docket No. UMBC-0012

'substantial change". Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the second detectable quality

"undergoes a sufficiently small percentage change when the protein sensing molecule is bound

to the analyte to function as a reference." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and

the claims that depend therefrom, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35

U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Patent Office's indication that claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 contain

allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has

been rewritten to include the allowable features of claim 8, and claim 8 has been canceled.

Claim 9 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form, and claim 12 has been amended to

depend from amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, 12 $\,$

and 13 are now allowable as containing subject matter which the Patent Office indicated is

allowable. Further, claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 are also allowable as depending from allowable

claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this

application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are

earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

9

Serial No. 10/552,164 Docket No. UMBC-0012 Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2009

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **René A. Vazquez, Esq.**, at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted, Sinergia Technology Law Group, PLLC

/René A. Vazquez, Esq./ Registration No. 38,647

Correspondence Address: P.O. Box 9744 McLean, VA 22102 (703) 880-6599 Date: July 31, 2009

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 68733